



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

mf

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,216	06/26/2003	Konstantin Zuev	ABBY-U09	4306

7590 02/16/2007  
ABBY Software Ltd.  
8, Butirskaya  
P.O. Box #72  
Moscow, 127015  
RUSSIAN FEDERATION

EXAMINER
----------

CARTER, AARON W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/16/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/603,216

Applicant(s)

ZUEV ET AL.

Examiner

Aaron W. Carter

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a *single paragraph* on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains several paragraphs.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### *Drawings*

2. The drawings are objected to because they are illegible. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the

Art Unit: 2624

remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 9-11 objected to because of the following informalities:

In line 2 of each claim the term "then" is used when the term "than" should have been used.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Regarding claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 define a “method...comprising”, however the limitations of “a bit-mapped image of the filled in form” and at least one model of a form...” do not recite steps of the method and appear to be apparatuses for use in the method and are therefore indefinite. See MPEP 2173.05(p) II.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the filled in form" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the form" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is indefinite as to whether the limitation is referring to the “machine-readable form image”, or the “filled in form”.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the image" in lines 10-11 and 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is indefinite as to whether the limitation is referring to the “machine-readable form image” or the “bit-mapped image”.

Claim 1 recites the limitation “of at least one data input field” in lines 13-14. It is indefinite as to whether the limitation is referring back to the limitation “at least one data input field” defined in lines 7-8.

Claim 1 recites the limitation “to at least one reference point” in line 14. It is indefinite as to whether the limitation is referring back to the limitation “a reference point” defined in line 7.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said form model description" in lines 16-17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The form model description is not previously defined in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the form image" in lines 21-22, 23 and 26. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is indefinite as to whether the limitation is referring to the “machine-readable form image” or the “bit-mapped image of the filled in form”.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said data input field position" in lines 27-28. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The data input field position is not previously defined in the claim.

Art Unit: 2624

Claim 2 recites the limitation “said reference point” in lines 1-2. It is indefinite as to whether the limitation is referring back to the limitation “a reference point” defined in line 7 or the limitation “to at least one reference point” defined in line 14.

Claim 5 recites the limitation “said data input field” in line 2. It is indefinite as to whether the limitation is referring back to the limitation “at least one data input field” defined in lines 7-8 or “at least one data input field” defined in lines 13-14.

Claim 6 recites the limitation “the data input field” in lines 1-2. It is indefinite as to whether the limitation is referring back to the limitation “at least one data input field” defined in lines 7-8 or “at least one data input field” defined in lines 13-14.

Claim 8 recites the limitation “the reference point spatial location” in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Examiner Note***

5. The lack of a prior art rejection is not an indication of allowance. Due to the numerous rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the Examiner may be required to apply a prior art rejection upon receiving an amendment or remarks clearing up all the indefinite limitations of the claims.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 5,182,656 to Chevion et al. discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,416,849 to Huang discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,235,654 to Anderson et al. discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,793,887 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 6,778,703 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

US 2002/0106128 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 6,640,009 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 6,760,490 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,257,328 to Shimizu discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.



Art Unit: 2624


USPN 5,025,484 to Yamanari et al. discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,191,525 to LeBrun et al. discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron W. Carter whose telephone number is (571) 272-7445. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 4:30 am (Mon. - Fri.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Aaron Carter  
AU 2624